

-11-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 31, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 19-29 and 37-38 and 40-54 are now pending in this Application. Claims 19, 37, 38 and 43 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Claims 1-18, 30-36 and 39 have been canceled and new claims 43-54 have been added

To further prosecution of this Application, Applicants submit the following remarks discussing the patentability of the rejected claims. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

I. Support for New Claims

Support for new claims 43 and 54 can be found at page 18, lines 25-28 and page 6, lines 10-18 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 44 can be found at page 16, lines 4-10, lines 16-19 and page 17, lines 19-29 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 45 can be found at page 18, lines 23-29 and page 16, lines 11-16 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 46 and new claim 52 can be found at page 17, lines 1-29, page 18, lines and page 4, lines 21-24 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 47 can be found at page 19, lines 1-8 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claims 48 and new claim 49 can be found at page 7, lines 11-21, page 20, lines 26-29 and page 16, lines 24-29 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 50 can be found at page 19, lines 15-20 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 51 can be found at page 8, lines 26-28 of Applicants' Specification.

Support for new claim 53 can be found at page 10, lines 26-29 of Applicants' Specification.

II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-11 and 19-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. **§112, ¶2**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-11 have been canceled and Applicants submit that independent claim 19, upon which claims 20-29 depend, has been amended to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. **§112** is requested.

III. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11, 19-29, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. **§103(a)** as being unpatentable over Blumenau (US Pat No. 6,505,240) in view of Merriman et al. (US Pat. No. 5,948,061) (hereinafter Merriman) and further in view of Thompson et al., (US Patent Pub. No. 2002/0077900) (hereinafter Thompson).

Claim 19 includes distinguishing limitations over the cited references. In particular, claim 19 recites **in response to intercepting the initial request: providing redirection information which indicates an identity of secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device**. In particular, none of the cited references disclose providing a requesting device with an identity of secondary content that must **be accessed** by a requesting device.

With regard to Merriman, a requesting device receives a link which includes an IP address to access an object from an advertisement server. (See Col. 3, Lines 35-37) The requesting device uses the received IP address to transmit a message to the advertisement server. (See Col. 3, Lines 41-44) Upon receiving the message, an advertising server process determines which advertisement to provide to the requesting device. (See Col. 3, Lines 52-57) Since the advertisement to be sent back to the requesting device is identified by the advertising server process, it follows that the requesting device is not provided with the **identity of the secondary content**. Rather than **indicating the secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device**, Merriman merely provides the requesting device with the location (i.e. the IP address) of the advertisement server. Again, the actual advertisement ultimately sent back to the requesting device is determined at the server itself. Thus, Merriman's requesting device is never provided with **an identity of secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device**. (See Col. 2, Lines 29-30)

In Blumenau, handoff instructions cause proxy content sites to provide content to content display sites. (See Col. 4, Lines 9-14) As discussed in Blumenau, there are three pieces of information that enable provision of content: the time at which a set of content must be received by a content display site, the set of content to be provided and the identity of the content providing site that will provide the content. (See Col. 9, Lines 12-19) Thus, instead of **indicating an identity of secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device**, Blumenau creates instructions indicating the identity of secondary content that must be provided from proxy content sites to the requesting device.

In addition, with regard to the tertiary reference Thompson, Examiner concedes that Thompson's interceptor is providing advertising content. Hence, the requesting device is receiving, not using redirection information to itself **access**, the advertising content. Moreover, Thompson discloses that advertising content is delivered independently of any code associated with the content request. (See ¶0006) Therefore, **the identity of the secondary content** (i.e. the advertising) is never indicated to the

-14-

requesting device before it is actually delivered by Thompson's interceptor. Thompson, therefore, fails to **indicate an identity of secondary content to be accessed by the requesting device**

For the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that neither Blumenau, Merriman nor Thompson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicants' independent claim 19. By virtue of their dependency on claim 19, claims 20-29 and 40 are not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by the cited references as well.

In addition, independent claims 37 and 38 recite similar limitations as claim 19. Thus, neither Blumenau, Merriman nor Thompson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicants' independent claims 37 and 38.

By virtue of claim 41's dependency on claim 37, claim 41 is not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by the cited references.

By virtue of claim 42's dependency on claim 38, claim 42 is not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested. If the rejection is to be maintained, Applicants request that it be pointed out with particularity where the cited reference discloses the claim limitations as disputed above.

IV. Rejection of Dependent Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. **§103(a)** as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Merriman and further in view of Thompson. However, Applicants submit that all three references fail to teach or suggest the claim 7 limitation of **redirection information comprising a second redirection command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content from the initial content source.**

As disclosed in Blumenau, the handoff instructions cause the proxy content providing sites to provide content to a content display site. (See Col. 4, Lines 9-15) Hence, since the proxy content providing sites provide content as a result of the primary content providing site's handoff instructions, then the handoff instructions are operable between the primary and proxy content providing sites. (See Col. 4, Lines 16-19) Hence, Blumenau's handoff instructions do not include **a command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access content.**

Merriman fails to make up for the deficiencies of Blumenau. Although Merriman's link (i.e. IP address) causes the requesting device to access the advertisement server, **a command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content from the initial content source** does not accompany the link. In fact, when Merriman's requesting device receives the message containing the link, the message already contains all the information available at the web site for the requested page (i.e. **the initial content source**). (See Col. 3, Lines 29-34) Thus, there is no need in Merriman for **a command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content from the initial content source.**

With regard to the tertiary reference Thompson, there is no **redirection information comprising a second redirection command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content from the initial content source.** Specifically, the request for initial content from Thompson's requesting device is merely delayed as an advertisement is played back to the requesting device. Hence, the Thompson's requesting device never receives redirection information that includes a **command operable by the requesting device to allow the requesting device to access the initial content.**

For the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that neither Blumenau, Merriman nor Thompson, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicants'

dependent claim 25. By virtue of dependency on claim 25, claim 26 is not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by the cited references as well.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested. If the rejection is to be maintained, Applicants request that it be pointed out with particularity where the cited reference discloses the claim limitations as disputed above.

V. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 39-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. **§103(a)** as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Merriman in view of Thompson and further in view of Subramaniam et al., (US Patent No. 6,081,900) (hereinafter Subramaniam).

Claim 39 has been canceled and Subramaniam, as a quaternary reference, fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Blumenau, Merriman and Thompson. Hence, any combination of Subramaniam with the cited references fails to teach or suggest Applicants' independent claims, upon which the claims 40-42 depend. Hence, by virtue of such dependency, claims 40- 42 are not taught or suggested, alone or in combination, by the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested.

-17-

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/RVF/

Rajesh V. Fotedar, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 59,562
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-05(3847)

Dated: January 18, 2008